

**Minutes**  
**Regular meeting of the City of Reading Planning Commission**  
**July 26, 2016 at 7:03 pm**

**Members present:**

Wayne Jonas Bealer, Chairman  
William F. Cinfici, Vice Chairman  
Michael E. Lauter, Secretary  
Ermete J. Raffaelli

**Staff present:**

Andrew W. Miller, Planning Office  
Ralph E. Johnson, Department of Public Works  
Deborah A.S. Hoag, Department of Public Works

**Others present:**

Gregg A. Bogia, Bogia Engineering Inc.  
Jamie L. Keith, Berks Surveying & Engineering Inc.  
Dale C. Egan, Egan & Egan LLC  
Thomas P. Egan, Egan & Egan LLC  
Aristides I. Otero, Stackhouse Bensinger Inc.  
George A. Fields, Watkins Architect Ltd.  
Patrick J. Dolan, Dolan Construction Inc.  
Anthony M. Balistrere, Berks Catholic High School Inc.  
Andrew J. Barton, Larson Design Group Inc.  
Dee Anderson, Hutchinson Realty Development LLC  
Paul Woolsey, Hutchinson Realty Development LLC  
Denise L. Dieter, Drier & Dieter Law Offices  
Matthew McGowan, ARF Corporation (dba Dunkin Donuts)  
Brian Murphy, ARF Corporation (dba Dunkin Donuts)  
Jay K. Stoudt, Stoudt Auto Sales Inc.  
John W. Hoffert, John W. Hoffert PLS Ltd.  
Clark Russell Copeland, St. John Missionary Baptist Church  
William J. Pochuski Jr., St. John Missionary Baptist Church  
David S. Johnson, Reading Eagle Company

Chairman Bealer called the July meeting to order and asked for acceptance of the agenda. Mr. Miller said he wasn't proposing any changes, but mentioned a request from the audience. Mr. Hoffert explained that he was requesting a waiver on behalf of St. John Missionary Baptist Church, who had been directed to submit a land development plan of their parking lot. Seeing no objection, Mr. Bealer suggested hearing it following the other land development presentations. Mr. Lauter moved to accept the July 26th agenda, as modified. Mr. Cinfici seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to accept the July agenda.

**Subdivision and Land Development:**

1100 Rockland Street Student Housing – final subdivision and land development plan [0:02.17]

Mr. Bogia distributed copies of the building rendering and, recalling the April 26th presentation by the architect, mentioned the masonry elements, a fiber-cement board siding and the exterior insulation and finishing system (EIFS) components. He said he'd relocated the fire hydrant, based on some recent consultation with the Reading Area Water Authority (RAWA), BCM Engineers Inc. and the Fire Marshal, and completed the signatures and certifications. Mr. Miller said he didn't have much to add to his latest review, thinking it likely resolved following some communication with the project manager. Mr. Bogia requested an approval, acknowledging the need to provide the municipal-improvements agreement. Ms. Hoag said her review of it was underway. Mr. Raffaelli repeated his objections, preferring that Albright College expand its own student housing offerings into the areas north and east on its campus. He opposed the size of the proposed building, the occupant load, the type of construction, the disruption of the retail area, other aesthetic elements of the façade, and the involvement and financing by a private developer. Mr. Miller asked if anything had changed regarding the number of rooms, the projected occupancy or intent for the commercial spaces. Mr. Bogia said not. Asked for any updates on the relocations of the displaced tenants, he understood the relocation of the Wine & Spirits store to be 'in process'. He confirmed that a water- and sanitary-line easement, shown on the previously-recorded 'Rockland Plaza' plans, had been included in the revisions. Mr. Miller recalled a concern about how the sidewalk of the proposed building

would match up with that of the existing shopping center. Mr. Bogia indicated its alignment on the plan. He confirmed that the southern and western elevations, not clear from the rendering, would be generally consistent with the look of the 'front', referring to the more-detailed elevations of the architectural plan. Mr. Lauter opined that it was unfortunate that the size, materials and colors wouldn't better match the surrounding, predominantly-brick buildings of the Albright College campus and the Rockland Street corridor. He realized it might not be within the Planning Commission's authority to make anything other than a recommendation, but warned that the paper rendering might not fully reflect the visual impact of the constructed building. Mr. Miller alluded to the frequent public perception that the Planning Commission does control such design issues and is therefore blamed for objectionable results. Mr. Lauter said he didn't mean it as a personal criticism of the architect, but felt the design misplaced. *[recording stopped at 23.48 in, and picking up at 23.29 into Part 1 of the BCTV file]* Ms. Hoag noted some green accenting of the shopping center, and the trend of periodic facelifts for similar commercial establishments. Mr. Bogia said he wasn't present for every discussion of the building design, feeling unprepared to explain the result. Mr. Miller said he didn't have anything further, and suggested the members add their thoughts on the façade design to the language of the resolution. He agreed that it wouldn't be an enforceable condition and, without the architect present, probably nothing the engineer himself could agree to. He appreciated the architect's early presentation of the design at the April 26th meeting. Mr. Lauter agreed, adding that it doesn't all 'sink in' at the first look and preferring that another 'final' presentation would have followed. He mentioned having visited the site, following the initial presentation, and reconsidering the look with that context.

Mr. Lauter moved to conditionally approve the final plan, upon its satisfaction of the latest Planning Office and Public Works Department reviews, and to further recommend that the architect reconsider the design of the façade to be more reflective of the surrounding theme and/or, at a minimum, the share of the red accenting suggested by the current rendering. Mr. Cinfici seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to conditionally approve the '1100 Rockland Street Student Housing' final plan.

#### Resolution #29-2016

#### Angelica Street Storage – final land development plan *[0:30.24, of the BCTV file Part 1]*

Dale Egan mentioned having made some modifications, in response to the Planning Office review, which he considered 'minor stuff'. Mr. Miller mentioned several responses to it, where the corrections were intended but not yet made to the plan. Dale Egan explained that the Zoning Office had directed the application to a zoning hearing for variance concerning the alley. *[picking up with the second audio file – about 9½ minutes lost – where at 32.51 into Part 1 of the BCTV file]* Thomas Egan clarified that it related to the distance of that alley from a street intersection. Mr. Miller recalled that they had intended further research on the status of that alley. Mr. Keith noted that it had been vacated in the 1960s, apparently a part of Park Avenue though it didn't follow the alignment of the segment on the opposite side of Angelica Street. Ms. Hoag mentioned an ordinance from 1968. Dale Egan said he obtained the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) information on the environmental assessments, received the Plumbing Inspector's permit for the new water service, and was just waiting for the Public Works Department's review. Ms. Hoag said the comments had been issued. Thomas Egan said they hadn't received them. Ms. Hoag said they were sent to the principal of Berks Surveying & Engineering Inc. Dale Egan asked to be copied on any correspondence. Ms. Hoag summarized the review, seeking the environmental assessment information, clarification of the 'site improvement' area and alley, boundary and easement details, elevation references, their intentions for some obsolete driveways, and a structural evaluation of the retaining/screening wall. Asked about the occupancy of the remaining building, and the notes referencing it, Dale Egan said a prospective tenant is still interested, but not confirmed, having just secured the plumbing permit to reconnect the water service. Mr. Miller noted the overlap between the Planning and Public Works reviews. He asked about the determination of the Berks County Conservation District. Mr. Keith said they still hadn't forwarded the plan, but didn't consider it to involve any 'earth disturbance'. Asked about the required grading to reroute the storm drainage to Angelica Street, he said stone would be used to adjust the elevations. Dale Egan described its placement atop the remaining concrete foundation. Mr. Miller reminded that they'd still need something in writing from the Conservation District. He asked about an existing stormwater inlet, shown behind remaining building but without any outlet piping. Mr. Keith said that let out toward the railroad property. Mr. Miller noted several of the adjoining ownerships referenced as 'record books' wondering if they meant deed books.

Mr. Raffaelli thought the 'decent-sized' parcel was being wasted. He suggested developing the property for something other than self-storage units, wondering at the relatively-recent need for such supplemental storage. Dale Egan explained that it was an expanding business generally, that 'people have more stuff', and they provide a service in response. He thought the visibility and circulation challenges of the site made a more-intensive use impractical. Mr. Bealer noted the issue of the Angelica Street-Park Avenue intersection and the hidden driveway. Ms. Hoag said it would be made more visible with the demolition and wondered about the expected traffic. Thomas Egan projected three to five visitors daily, for every hundred units, still unsure of their total count, but estimating it

at just over 120. Mr. Miller thought the intersection more confused by the maneuvering of trucks at the loading docks of the neighboring Bimbo Bakeries. He noted that one of the proposed buildings appeared to be more detailed in its internal divisions. Thomas Egan explained that it was the climate-controlled portion of the project, only accessible through the 'office' part of the facility and not a 24-hour availability. Mr. Cinfici thought that might be the first of its kind available in the City. Dale Egan thought so too, expecting it would be attractive for storing business records. Asked about their market research and their typical customer, he said the options begin at a five-by-five-foot 'closet', increasing from there. He said some lessees have seasonable needs, others are preparing for a move, and some are simply lazy or otherwise unable to part with their possessions. Asked if there were any other questions on the Planning Office review, Mr. Keith said not. Dale Egan asked if there had been any movement on the improvements agreement for their 245 West Greenwich Street ('Egan Storage') project. Ms. Hoag thought Public Works had already covered their part of it. Mr. Miller noted it had been three months since the approval, necessitating a reaffirmation vote. Mr. Bealer asked about any deadlines concerning the present project. Mr. Miller expected the zoning appeal implied an eventual need to extend the plan review timeframe. He said his review is 'finite' and hoped they would defer any further presentation until the Planning Commission was able to act on it.

Mr. Raffaelli moved to table the final plan for the self-storage units at 20 Angelica Street. Mr. Lauter seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to table the 'Angelica Street Storage' final plan.

#### Building Addition-Stadium Upgrades (Berks Catholic) – final land development plan [0:23.34]

Mr. Otero recalled the February 23rd sketch presentation, saying not much about the design had changed since. He noted six classrooms, an expansion of the cafeteria, an open area for a 'learning center', a small stair-tower addition, interior upgrades to the auditorium, the replacement of the existing track, the grass-to-artificial-turf conversion of the athletic field, and some minor parking lot changes. Mr. Raffaelli questioned the issues involving the stormwater facilities. Mr. Otero said he'd been discussing a 'game plan' with the Public Works Department and the Berks County Conservation District. Ms. Hoag acknowledged that discussion regarding the capacity of the detention basin and the changes in drainage patterns. She mentioned a second basin, which Mr. Otero thought 'too far away' from the area at issue. Ms. Hoag advised some further analysis of the capacity and connections. Mr. Otero said he was working to finalize the erosion-control plan, and mentioned an approach of amended soils, a seed mix, additional plantings and a piping upgrade. Mr. Raffaelli recalled the design of an earlier addition, supposed to include screening along the parking lot fronting East Wyomissing Boulevard, but never installed. Asked about a zoning permit, Mr. Otero mentioned receiving one in February, though the Zoning Administrator had requested building elevations not available at that conceptual stage. Mr. Miller observed that the present plan differs somewhat from that presented in February. Mr. Otero noted that a planned expansion to rear of the school, for a weight room, had been cancelled, while another 200 square feet had been added to the front part. Mr. Miller confirmed that the latest version had been forwarded to the Zoning Administrator. He recalled the discussion of the parking needs at the February meeting. Mr. Otero counted a three-space net increase following the reconfiguration. He understood the concern, but calculated the provision at nearly double the zoning-required minimum and considered it an intermittent problem. Ms. Hoag understood the position that the major increase in enrollment had already occurred with the consolidation of Holy Name and Central Catholic, and asked about the demand for student parking when compared with the 130 permits said to be reserved for the purpose. Mr. Balistrere said there were 30-40 extra spaces available (unused permits) in that count. Mr. Raffaelli observed a tendency of parking on the East Wyomissing Boulevard landscaped islands, causing damage to the landscaping therein. Mr. Balistrere said that Berks Catholic had taken over the maintenance of the two islands fronting their property. Ms. Hoag suggested the possibility of directing stormwater flows to those islands. Mr. Otero prefer to avoid the off-site complication, intending some further evaluation of the basin function and capacity. Asked about the Berks County Planning Commission's input, Mr. Miller characterized it as their standard recommendations. He asked if they intended similar conversions of the baseball and softball fields in the future, recalling an early inquiry. Mr. Balistrere called it 'cost prohibitive', estimating another \$2½-3 million for the turf installation alone. He said that, if ever, it would allow for 'single campus' athletic programming, whereas they currently use Shemanski Stadium in Saint Lawrence Borough. He projected the renovation of the multi-purpose field at about \$1.1-1.2 million. He characterized the investment associated with the current plan as 85 percent 'academic' and 15 percent 'extracurricular'.

Turning to the architectural details, Mr. Fields described the expansion, the interior divisions and their uses, including an auditorium balcony adding another 183 seats to the 786 existing. Mr. Balistrere counted 800 students and another 50 in the faculty, needing the space for mass and other assemblies. Mr. Lauter referred to the other and occasionally-public functions, questioning the basis of the off-street parking requirements given its potential use and capacity. Mr. Miller said there was some interpretation in what could be considered as 'accessory uses' to the school and with regard to the potential for simultaneous uses at full occupancy. He suggested a comparison of the different calculations if based upon the theater and/or stadium standards. Ms. Hoag recalled the mention of arrangements with neighboring parking lots for large events. Mr. Otero called it more of a 'program management'

issue. Mr. Miller said their calculation may be technically correct, but still not always provide for the demand. He explained that the parking formulae are part of the Zoning Ordinance. Others noted the County-wide enrollment at the school and the expectation that a greater share of it would be traveling by car when compared with other schools more likely to be within walking distance of their students. As the conversation turned back toward the stormwater issues, Mr. Otero agreed that was the biggest issue cited in the staff reviews. Mr. Johnson agreed that the parking concerns were valid, hoping that the discussion continued. Mr. Miller asked for the comparative numbers. Asked about the façade materials, Mr. Fields described a combination of brick and metal paneling and ‘a lot of glazing’. He said they intended to duplicate the existing brick style. Mr. Miller suggested they again present the rendering when further developed.

Mr. Raffaelli moved to table the final plan for the Berks Catholic expansion and athletic field. Mr. Cinfici seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to table Berks Catholic’s ‘Building Addition-Stadium Upgrades’ final plan.

#### Warren Street Properties: Warren Street Dunkin Donuts – preliminary land development plan [1:02.16]

Mr. Barton described the three parcels included in the site plan – one vacant but for a billboard, one a part of Stoudt Auto Sales, and a residential property behind it – intending to consolidate two for the building with the third for the parking. He measured the restaurant at 1868 square feet with twenty off-street parking spaces. He said they were granted a variance for an ‘accessory commercial use in the residential district’ and a driveway width of 24 feet. He indicated the proposed connection to the existing storm sewer, and a reduction in the total impervious cover. He acknowledged the Planning Office review, intending to comply, but wanting to discuss three of its points. Asked to explain the traffic circulation, he described the trucks from the Warren Street Bypass entering via Allegheny Avenue and leaving via Carbon Street. He said they had previously shown a separate loading area, but the Zoning Hearing Board asked that they modify it. Mr. Lauter questioned the route of the customers. Mr. Barton said they could enter and exit from either Allegheny Avenue or Carbon Street. He said the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (PennDOT) will require the closure of the alley bisecting the site, including curbing across its opening to the Bypass. He went on to describe the means of continued access to the billboard by a turf-reinforcing product and a bollard restriction to other traffic. Ms. Hoag mentioned having attended a PennDOT meeting, and recognizing revisions from the plan shown then. Mr. Bealer raised the issue of the limited sidewalk on Allegheny Avenue and the matter of a waiver. Mr. Miller agreed a waiver would be required, and for what would ordinarily be required along the Bypass frontage, while acknowledging the terms of the highway-occupancy permitting. Asked about any landscaping, Mr. Barton described some shrubs and small trees, not to exceed a twenty-foot height in order to preserve views of the billboard, and other plantings and fencing intended to screen the neighboring residential property. Mr. Bealer recalled an earlier design, presented at the September 22, 2015 meeting, and limited to the 1343 Allegheny Avenue parcel. He thought the expanded area might better address the Commission’s traffic ‘stacking’ concerns.

Mr. Lauter asked for some clarification of the building layout, beginning with the location of the pickup window. Ms. Hoag said the building had been rotated, in response to another recommendation of PennDOT for the improved traffic circulation through the site. Mr. Lauter felt a ‘side’ of the building was facing the Bypass, suggesting it could be made to appear as a more-presentable ‘front’. Ms. Anderson introduced the attendees representing Dunkin Donuts. As the conversation turned toward possible modifications of the signage, Mr. Barton stated that they had a permit establishing the compliance of the signage as shown. There was confusion from the architectural elevations displayed, until it was realized that they were rendered in a reversed (mirrored) view. Mr. Cinfici questioned the identification of the entrance, and whether Bypass traffic would more likely enter from Allegheny or Carbon, as a matter of reaction time. Mr. Lauter thought that another reason why the orientation of the building’s ‘front’ important. Ms. Anderson expected the billboard would obscure the view of the restaurant. Ms. Dieter hoped to avoid any changes requiring another appeal to the Hearing Board. She referred to a comment in the Planning Office review suggesting other designs for the billboard access, seeking clarification. Mr. Miller felt that, since the billboard would be surrounded by the paving of the driveways and parking spaces, they could do without the additional driveway reserved for the billboard. Ms. Dieter said the Lamar Advertising Company required it due to the size of a crane servicing it. Mr. Barton explained that their work is typically performed with more-standard trucks and the built-in catwalks, but required a crane every 10 to 15 years. Ms. Dieter thought it potentially more often and described the sign company as adamant. Mr. Barton agreed they should be able to make do with the surrounding drives. Ms. Anderson said the issue was more-fully discussed at the zoning hearing.

Mr. Raffaelli recommended an alternate design, recognizing a potential reconstruction of the Warren Street Bypass and the Schuylkill Avenue interchange. He described the condemnations necessary for the design of a deceleration lane and the closures of the intersecting streets, as PennDOT previously had on the north side of the Bypass. He thought the site might not remain viable. Mr. Barton said they hadn’t mentioned any such intent when they met over the ‘scoping application’. Ms. Hoag said she wasn’t aware of any such reference in the latest



Transportation Improvement Program or any other long-range planning documents, and had met onsite with the County and District 5 permitting engineers.

Mr. Bealer asked about the 15-foot-wide alley and the effect on the parcel annexations. Mr. Barton counted three parcels currently and two following the annexation of the Carbon Street parcels. Mr. Miller noted that everything else about the plan – the setbacks measured, the total area, the coverage calculations, et cetera – reflects a single parcel. Mr. Bealer indicated they'd need a cross-access easement, at a minimum. Mr. Miller said the required parking must be made a part of and remain with the restaurant property. Ms. Dieter agreed that was a 'reasonable' expectation, but countered the Planning Office's position on the alley. Mr. Bealer advised they pursue a quiet-title action, recalling a similar situation affecting an earlier subdivision plan (the 2007 'Cotton Street Subdivision'). Ms. Dieter distributed copies of a legal opinion. Mr. Miller said he would forward it to the City's Law Department for their review. Ms. Dieter said that while open, the owner/seller contends it was never maintained or used by City and therefore, after 21 years, extinguishes the public right and reverts in equal shares from the centerline to the adjoining owners. Mr. Miller explained that he wasn't referring to any City claim at all. Ms. Dieter said that any potential private right was similarly extinguished and, further, that a Commonwealth Court decision prevents a municipality from requiring such title work as a condition of a plan approval. She said the neighbors would have to assert that claim themselves. Mr. Bealer resented the reflex of attorneys to complicate the issue and avoid the diligence advised for their client's own protection. Ms. Dieter said she understood the concern, but repeated that the plan's approval cannot depend on it. Mr. Miller acknowledged the civil nature of the matter and referred to the language he intentionally chose for his review comments. Ms. Dieter went on to dispute another comment advising a zoning map amendment to resolve the residential classification of 1340 Carbon Street. Mr. Miller again deferred to the Law Department, and noted the 'final plan' requirements that will follow the preliminary stage. He wondered how the law provided for the 'use variance' granted and suggested there was a more 'proper' procedure. Ms. Dieter said it was 'one or the other' based on her 23 years of experience. Asked plainly whether they intended to seek a map amendment, she said she wasn't sure and that there was no guarantee of success. Mr. Miller asked what the zoning permit directed. Ms. Dieter wasn't sure that a zoning permit was issued. Ms. Anderson produced one, intending to provide a copy to the Planning Office. Mr. Miller read the condition of the zoning map amendment referenced on the permit (Control No. 2016-15). Ms. Dieter explained that requirement had been deleted. Ms. Anderson presented the Hearing Board's written decision, bearing the hand-written and initialed strike-throughs of its terms by the Board's solicitor. Ms. Anderson said they could go back to the Hearing Board to 'get that'. Mr. Raffaelli suggested the Commission should seek legal advice, as they were presently unrepresented.

Mr. Miller asked if there were any other questions on his review. Mr. Barton said not. Mr. Lauter asked for clarification on the intended locations of internal curbing around the building and driveways, thinking a barrier might be necessary to control traffic in the drive-through queue. Mr. Barton thought it limited to the building side of the driveway, but needing to clarify that with the store operator. Asked about the limited sidewalk being proposed, Mr. Barton confirmed it would be maintained by the store operator. Mr. Miller asked to see the revised loading-area design, and a turning movement plan showing it crossing some proposed parking spaces, wondering about the maneuver whenever they were occupied. Mr. Barton said the Hearing Board had requested the change. Mr. McGowan mentioned the coordination of the deliveries, expected about once a week. Mr. Miller asked that it be described in the plan notes. Asked if it was intended as a 24-hour operation, Mr. McGowan thought not. Ms. Hoag said the Public Works Department was finalizing its review.

Mr. Cinfici moved to table the preliminary plan for the proposed Dunkin Donuts. Mr. Lauter seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to table LGN Management's 'Warren Street Properties: Warren Street Dunkin Donuts' preliminary plan.

#### St. John Baptist Church [2:07.49]

Mr. Hoffert recalled his involvement beginning in 2008 and attempted to explain the background events. He said he was then contacted by Eddie Smith, of Smith Contracting, who was hired to clear the site and ready it for off-street parking. He said he arrived to find nothing left but macadam and compacted stone and proceeded to layout the parking design. He remembered some discussion of a land development plan, at the time, but was only directed to address the stormwater issues. The Plumbing Inspector approved a plan for a barrier to divert runoff to a catch basin, with piping under the sidewalk and emptying to the street. He believed everything had then been satisfied, until the most-recent direction to file a land development plan. He said it has existing in its current condition for eight years of Sunday-only use, and requested a waiver based on the time elapsed. He introduced the Church representatives in attendance and said 'the lot works', includes some limited buffering in the form of a grass strip, and is used by a neighbor to access to his own parking area. He thanked the Commission for the opportunity to present the plan. Mr. Bealer asked if the stormwater infrastructure was properly permitted and installed. Mr. Hoffert explained that the property was formerly occupied by a Slovak-American social club, with one existing

catch basin. He designed the second (southern) inlet as part of his design. Mr. Pochuski related on-going problems with trespass and dumping on the property, intending to install bollards and chain to block access when the Church wasn't using it. He said they'd been through the zoning hearing, still needed approval by Historical Architectural Review Board (HARB), and noted the financial hardship on their small congregation. He said the HARB is requiring the Planning Commission's approval first. Mr. Bealer thought the Commission would need something 'of record'. Mr. Raffaelli recalled the earlier attempts to settle the matter and asked the staff about 'any reservations'. Mr. Miller called it a violation and explained that the Zoning Hearing Board and HARB had made a retroactive review a condition of their own approvals. He felt that, without an application, the Planning Commission shouldn't be taking any action. He said he hadn't pursued it, in those eight years, and that, if the Commission's review was being avoided, it shouldn't be expected to pretend otherwise. He thought the resistance primarily about the associated fees, that everyone else has to pay, and thought the issue was long forgotten. Mr. Pochuski agreed that the fees were a burden, having already paid for the zoning hearing, but also hoped to avoid the required studies for an existing development. He thought it 'borderline insanity'. Mr. Miller opined that, if the Hearing Board and the HARB felt that strongly about it, they should pursue it, adding that the design of parking lots is covered wholly within the Zoning Ordinance. Asked if lighting was required, Mr. Pochuski said they already had their zoning permit, but were told to study it. Mr. Copeland said they've been in the City for 70 years, and would like to set the right example. Mr. Miller noted that there hadn't been any enforcement notices or other direction from either the Planning Office or Planning Commission. He said their dispute was the Hearing Board and the HARB, who set the condition, not with the Planning Office, who was nonetheless expected to answer for it. Asked to explain the events that led to the present enforcement, Mr. Pochuski said they were stopped by the Zoning Office when installing the bollards, and directed to the review process. Mr. Hoffert said he would request that relief from the Hearing Board and the HARB. He wondered, if they declined, if the Planning Commission would 'soften' the land development requirements and consider specific waivers. Mr. Miller stated that no parking lot is ever subjected to full requirements of the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance. Mr. Hoffert acknowledged his own prior experiences and 'temporarily' withdrew the waiver request.

#### **Other business:**

##### §609.c review-proposed zoning ordinance amendment, deleting the §600-2111.B exemption [2:32.23]

Mr. Miller didn't have any additional commentary and noted the public hearing scheduled for August 1st. He referred to the model ordinance provided, expecting a variation of it to be considered at a future meeting.

Mr. Lauter moved to recommend that City Council enact the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment, deleting its §600-2111.B exemption for 'PUC regulated corporations'. Mr. Cinfici seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to forward their recommendation to City Council, as provided for by §609.c of the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code.

**Resolution #30-2016**

##### §513.a approval reaffirmation-Egan Storage [2:34.23]

Mr. Cinfici moved to reaffirm the April 2016 land development plan approval, in order to reset the Pennsylvania Municipalities Planning Code's deadline for plan recording. Mr. Raffaelli seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to reaffirm their April 26th approval, Resolution No. 13-2016, for the 'Egan Storage' final plan for 245 West Greenwich Street.

**Resolution #31-2016**

##### review the draft June 28, 2016 meeting minutes [2:35.13]

Mr. Miller intended a few edits of his own, but nothing in terms of content. Mr. Bealer requested one grammatical correction.

Mr. Lauter moved to accept the June 28th minutes, with the corrections. Mr. Cinfici seconded. And the Commission voted unanimously to accept the June meeting minutes.

**Resolution #32-2016**

Mr. Lauter moved to adjourn the July meeting. Mr. Raffaelli seconded. And the Commission adjourned the July 26th meeting. – 10:15p